

Appl. No. 10/605,837
Amdt. dated March 30, 2006
Reply to Office action of February 01, 2006

REMARKS

In response to the rejections made on claims 1 and 6 under U.S.C 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S Patent No. 5,995,454 Yamaki, the applicant has provided the following response.

5

The rejection of claims 1 and 6 on Yamaki under 35 U.S.C. 102(b)

Applicant has amended claim 1 to include all the limitations of claim 6 and has respectfully cancelled claim 6. Additionally, some antecedent basis problems that were originally present in claim 6 are corrected in currently amended claim 1, and the starting the computer limitation is also amended to state "starting the computer upon receiving the power good signal". No new matter is entered. For example, refer to step 160 from Figure 2 of the present invention stating, "When the power supply 50 receives a power on signal from the Southbridge chipset 40, the power supply 50 will power all the pins in its connector. The power supply 50 will then check to make sure that the voltages in all the pins are stable before sending a power good signal to the computer 10. Upon receiving the power good signal, the computer 10 will self-start". Applicant asserts that Yamaki does not teach "checking if the voltages in the pins of the power supply connector are stable; sending a power good signal from the power supply to a processor of the computer; and starting the computer upon receiving the power good signal", as per the limitations stated in the newly amended claim 1. The examiner has suggested in the response that this is inherently performed according to the prior art, but has left no reference or example to confirm this. Applicant points out that the checking of the voltages in the pins of the power supply for stability is in fact not taught by the Yamaki prior art, but is however taught in the description of operation in the present invention. Therefore, applicant asserts that the checking for stability of the voltages in the pins of the power supply limitation as claimed in the present invention should not be found anticipated by Yamaki.

Appl. No. 10/605,837
Amdt. dated March 30, 2006
Reply to Office action of February 01, 2006

Applicant also asserts that Yamaki does not teach "sending a power good signal from the power supply to the processor of the computer", as is claimed in currently amended claim 1. The sending of the power good signal provides confirmation that stability in the voltages of the pins of the power supply has been reached, allowing the computer to properly self-start. (see step 160) Examiner has referred to Yamaki (Col.7 lines 14-21) as a prior art example. However, closer inspection of that reference will show that Yamaki is discussing in that section a "usual power-on process" if system startup is not initiated by the alarm (ie manual startup). Additionally, Yamaki simply states "The system operation includes supplying electric power to all of the devices and booting up the operating system". There is no mention of a power good signal. Therefore, applicant asserts that the reference provided by the examiner does not teach the sending of a power good signal from the power supply prior to starting the computer.

For at least the above mentioned reasons, applicant asserts that the present invention as claimed in currently amended claim 1 is not anticipated by Yamaki U.S Patent No. 5,995,454, and respectfully requests that the Examiner re-evaluate the limitations of currently amended claim 1 for its allowance.

In response to the rejections made on claims 1,4, 7-9 under U.S.C 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S Patent No. 6,134,187 Tomiyasu, the applicant has provided the following response.

The rejection of claims 1,4 and 7-9 on Tomiyasu under 35 U.S.C. 102(b)

Regarding claim 1, as previously described, applicant has amended claim 1 to include the limitations of claim 6. Please see the above remarks for further information regarding the amendments made for claim 1.

Appl. No. 10/605,837
Amdt. dated March 30, 2006
Reply to Office action of February 01, 2006

Regarding claims 4 and 7-9, applicant asserts that these claims are dependant on currently amended claim 1. Should the Examiner make an allowance for newly amended claim 1, applicant asserts that claims 4 and 7-9 should be allowed also as they are dependant upon claim 1.

5

In response to the rejections made on claims 2,3, and 5 under U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S Patent No. 5,995,454 Yamaki in view of Lin et al US 20030095044, the applicant has provided the following response.

10 **The rejection of claims 2,3 and 5 on Yamaki and Lin et al. under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)**

Regarding claims 2,3 and 5, applicant asserts that these claims are dependant on currently amended claim 1. Should the Examiner make an allowance for newly amended claim 1, applicant asserts that claims 2,3 and 5 should additionally be allowed also as they are dependant upon claim 1.

15

The cancellation of claims 10-16


Applicant has canceled claims 10-16.

20

25

Appl. No. 10/605,837
Amdt. dated March 30, 2006
Reply to Office action of February 01, 2006

Sincerely yours,



Date: 03.30.2006

Winston Hsu, Patent Agent No. 41,526

5 P.O. BOX 506, Merrifield, VA 22116, U.S.A.

Voice Mail: 302-729-1562

Facsimile: 806-498-6673

e-mail : winstonhsu@naipo.com

- 10 Note: Please leave a message in my voice mail if you need to talk to me. (The time in D.C. is 13 hours behind the Taiwan time, i.e. 9 AM in D.C. = 10 PM in Taiwan.)